

REMARKS

In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application.

OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION

The Office objected to the specification because the trademarks “Kerberos” and “Windows Server 2003” were not capitalized and accompanied by generic terminology. Applicant has amended the specification to address these informalities. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection.

OBJECTION UNDER 37 CFR 1.75(c)

The Office objected to Claims 19 and 37 under 37 CFR 1.75(c) for failing to further limit the subject matter of their respective previous claims. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the rejection and in the interest of expediting allowance of the application, Applicant has amended Claims 19 and 37. Claim 19 was amended to recite “A computer readable storage medium comprising computer readable instructions that when executed by a processor performs the method of claim 1.” Claim 37 was amended to recite “A computer readable storage medium comprising the modules recited in claim 20.”

During the interview the Office agreed to withdraw the rejection. Applicant thanks the Office for this indication.

The Office objected to Claim 20 because of informality. Applicant has amended Claim 20 to address the informality and respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of these objections.

REJECTION UNDER §112 SECOND PARAGRAPH

The Office rejected Claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §112, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the rejection, and with the intent of expediting allowance of this applicant, Applicant has amended Claim 9 to clarify that the resource identifier is obtained from a computing system performing the “method of claim 1.”

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request withdrawal of the objection.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Office rejected Claims 1, 19, 20, 37, and 38 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Choy, U.S. Patent No. 6,141,754 (Choy). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 1, 19, 20, 37, and 38, as amended recite:

1. A method of processing multiple types of security schemes, comprising:
receiving a message having an associated token, wherein the token is associated with a subject;

authenticating the token by extracting a first claim and a second claim from the token, wherein the first and second claims comprise a statement about the subject;

grouping the first and second claims into a claim collection by selectively mapping the first claim to the second claim; and

authorizing the first and second claims by mapping them to other claims.

19. A computer readable storage medium comprising computer readable instructions that executed by a processor performs the method of claim 1.

20. A system configured to process multiple types of security schemes, the system comprising:

one or more computer processors; and

one or more computer readable storage media, executable by the one or more processors, to store:

a first module to extract a first claim and a second claim from a token associated with a message, wherein the message has an associated subject and the first and second claims comprise a statement related to the subject; and

a second module to selectively map the first claim to the second claim.

37. A computer readable storage medium comprising the modules recited in claim 20.

38. A computer-readable storage medium containing computer-executable instructions, that when executed by a computer performs the following steps:

receiving a message having an associated token, wherein the token is associated with a subject;

obtaining a first claim and a second claim from the token, wherein the first and second claims comprise a statement about the subject; and

selectively mapping the first claim to the second claim.

In rejecting Claims 1, 19, 20, 37, and 38, the Office stated that Choy anticipated the Claims. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of expediting allowance, and without conceding the propriety of the Office's rejection, Applicant has amended independent Claims 1, 19, 20, 37, and 38 as discussed and during

the interview. Applicant submits that Choy at least fails to disclose or suggest the added Claim language. During the interview, the Office agreed. Applicant thanks the Office for this indication.

For at least these reasons, independent Claims 1, 19, 20, 37, and 38 are allowable over Choy.

Claims 2-4, 6-18, 21-36, and 39-48

Claims 2-4, 6-18, 21-36, and 39-48 depend from independent Claims 1, 20, and 38 and are allowable at least due to their dependency from Claims 1, 20, and 38 as well as for the features they recite.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office rejected Claims 2-5, 12-16, 21-23, 30-34, 39, 40, and 43-47 as being unpatentable over Choy. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

As noted, Choy does not disclose the features recited in Claims 1, 20, and 38. Furthermore, Choy does not teach or suggest the features recited in Claims 1, 20, and 38. During the interview, the Office agreed. Applicant thanks the Office for this indication. Claims 2-5, 12-16, 21-23, 30-34, 39, 40, and 43-47 depend from independent Claims 1, 20, and 38 and are therefore allowable at least due to their dependency from Claims 1, 20, and 38, as well as for the features they recite.

The Office rejected Claims 6, 8-11, 24, 26-29, 41, and 42 as being unpatentable over Choy in view of R. Fielding, RFC 1808 (hereinafter “Fielding”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Choy does not teach or suggest the features recited in Claims 1, 20, and 38. During the interview, the Office agreed. Applicant thanks the Office for this indication. In addition, Fielding fails to cure the deficiency of Choy. Claims 6, 8-11, 24, 26-29, 41, and 42 depend from independent Claims 1, 20, and 38 and are therefore allowable at least due to their dependency from Claims 1, 20, and 38, as well as for the features they recite.

The Office rejected Claims 7 and 8 as being unpatentable over Choy, in view of Fielding, and in further view of Clark et al., XML Path Language (hereinafter "Clark"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Choy and Fielding do not teach or suggest the features recited in Claims 1 and 20. During the interview, the Office agreed. Applicant thanks the Office for this indication. In addition, Clark fails to cure the deficiency of Choy and Fielding. Claims 7 and 8 depend from independent Claims 1 and 20 and are therefore allowable at least due to their dependency from Claims 1 and 20 as well as for the features they recite.

The Office rejected Claims 17, 18, 35, 36, and 48 as being unpatentable over Choy in view of Lynch, U.S. 6,487,600 (hereinafter Lynch) Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Choy does not teach or suggest the features recited in Claims 1, 20, and 38. During the interview, the Office agreed. Applicant thanks the Office for this indication. In addition, Lynch fails to cure the deficiency of Choy. Claims 17, 18, 35, 36, and 48 depend from independent Claims 1, 20, and 38 and are therefore allowable at least due to their dependency from Claims 1, 20, and 38 as well as for the features they recite.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-4 and 6-48 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the subject application. Should any matter remain unresolved, the undersigned respectfully requests a telephone conference with the Examiner to resolve any outstanding matter.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: _____

1/10/08

By: _____

Jeffrey Valley

Lee & Hayes, PLLC

Reg. No. 50,563

(509) 324-9256 x262